

7. Early coordination with Agencies.

a. Intra-Agency Coordination.

i) Bureau of Aeronautics

- ☐ No – Coordination is not required. Project is not located within 2 miles (3.22 kilometers) of a public or military use airport nor would the project change the horizontal or vertical alignment of a transportation facility located within 6.44 kilometers (4 miles) of a public use or military airport.
- ☒ Yes - Coordination has been completed and project effects have been addressed. Explain: The northern terminus of the project is located approximately 2.5 miles from the New Richmond Municipal Airport. WisDOT Bureau of Aeronautics stated in a letter dated March 18, 2004 that airport will not be affected by the project, but the height-limitation zoning ordinance must be followed. Correspondence is presented in Appendix B.

ii) District Office Real Estate Section

- ☐ No – Coordination is not required because no inhabited houses or active businesses will be acquired.
- ☐ Yes – Coordination has been completed. Project effects and relocation assistance have been addressed. Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan is to be completed prior to final design and construction.

Coordination with the WisDOT NW Region Real Estate Section will occur during a later design phase.

b. Interagency Coordination

STATE AGENCY	COORDINATION Attached? Y-Yes N-No	COMMENTS Explain or give results. If no correspondence is attached to this document, indicate when coordination with the agency was initiated and, if available, when coordination was completed
Agriculture (DATCP)	Yes	The project was introduced to DATCP through a letter sent February 17, 2004; DATCP declined to comment on the project at that time. Written coordination continued and a meeting with DATCP was held on May 5, 2005. DATCP responded with a letter dated June 27, 2005 in which DATCP presented its opinions regarding the project. DATCP stated in the letter that any of the South Roberts Bypass alternatives (A-1, A-2, A-3) are preferable to the North Bypass Alternative. Because land use in the area is likely to change before the highway improvements are made, DATCP stated that it would not be useful to prepare an Agricultural Impact Statement at this time. Correspondence is attached in Appendix B.

STATE AGENCY	COORDINATION Attached? Y-Yes N-No	COMMENTS Explain or give results. If no correspondence is attached to this document, indicate when coordination with the agency was initiated and, if available, when coordination was completed
Natural Resources (DNR)	Yes	The project was introduced to WDNR through an invitation to the Operational Planning Meeting sent January 22, 2004. Jim Doperalski attended the February 5, 2004 meeting. An invitation to the May 4, 2005 Agency Coordination Meeting was sent April 11, 2005. Mr. Doperalski and Nick Schaff attended the Agency Coordination Meeting. Mr. Doperalski and Mr. Schaff presented their comments about the meeting and project in a letter dated May 23, 2005. Another meeting was held with Mr. Schaff and Mr. Chet McCarty of the US Fish and Wildlife Service on July 6, 2005 to discuss impacts the project may have on the Kerber Waterfowl Production Area. Mr. Schaff summarized his comments from the meeting and indicated WDNR's preferred alternative in a letter dated July 20, 2005. A final meeting was held with Mr. Schaff on March 31, 2006, at which Mr. Schaff stated that WDNR favored the alignment of Section 1 Alternative A-2. Correspondence is attached in Appendix B.
State Historical Society (SHS)	No	The project was introduced to SHS through an invitation to the Operational Planning Meeting sent January 22, 2004. Correspondence with SHS through submittal of the Section 106 Form will be conducted through WisDOT. No correspondence is attached.
West Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission WCWRPC	Yes	The project was introduced to WCWRPC through an invitation to the Operational Planning Meeting sent January 22, 2004. A representative did not attend the meeting. Don Kush of WCWRPC attended the May 4, 2005 Agency Coordination Meeting; a follow up letter was sent to Mr. Kush that requested WCWRPC comment on the project. No response was received; no correspondence is attached.

FEDERAL AGENCY	COORDINATION Attached? Y-Yes N-No	COMMENTS Explain or give results. If no correspondence is attached to this document, indicate when coordination with the agency was initiated and, if available, when coordination was completed
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)	N	Not applicable
Corps of Engineers (COE)	Yes	The project was introduced to COE through an invitation to the Operational Planning Meeting sent January 22, 2004. COE provided general comment on the project in a letter dated January 27, 2004. In the letter, COE stated that a Department of the Army permit would be required prior to construction. An invitation to the May 4, 2005 Agency Coordination Meeting was sent April 11, 2005; a COE representative did not attend. Correspondence is attached in Appendix B.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	No	Not applicable
Native American Tribes	Yes	<p>In accordance with WisDOT policy, all required Native American tribes were notified of the proposed project via a letter dated February 18, 2004. Contacted groups and tribes include: Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; Forest County Potawatomi Community of Wisconsin; <u>HoChunk Nation</u>; <u>Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin</u>; Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Indians of Wisconsin; Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin – Red Cliff Tribal Council; Sokaogon Chippewa Community – Mole Lake Band; St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin; Sac and Fox Nations of Oklahoma, of Missouri and of the Mississippi in Iowa; Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma; and Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation.</p> <p>Responses were received from the tribes underlined above. Correspondence is presented in Appendix B.</p>
National Park Service (NPS)	No	Not applicable

Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)	No	The project was introduced to NRCS through an invitation to the Operational Planning Meeting sent January 22, 2004. A NRCS representative did not attend the meeting. An invitation to the May 4, 2005 Agency Coordination Meeting was sent April 11, 2005; a NRCS representative did not attend. Steve Pernsteiner of NRCS stated during an April 18, 2005 telephone conversation that NRCS typically does not get involved in this stage of projects, but will likely provide comment prior to construction.
US Coast Guard (USCG)	No	Not applicable
US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Yes	The project was introduced to USFWS through an invitation to the Operational Planning Meeting sent January 22, 2004. Chet McCarty attended the February 5, 2004 meeting. An invitation to the May 4, 2005 Agency Coordination Meeting was sent April 11, 2005. Mr. McCarty attended the Agency Coordination Meeting. USFWS presented general comments about the project in a letter dated May 3, 2005. Another meeting was held with Mr. McCarty and a WDNR representative on July 6, 2005 to discuss impacts the project may have on the Kerber Waterfowl Production Area. Mr. McCarty presented his comments from the meeting and indicated USFWS's preferred alternative in a letter dated August 31, 2005. Correspondence is attached in Appendix B

– END –

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS	EFFECTS				COMMENTS
	Adverse	Benefit	None	Not Applicable	
SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS					
A. General Economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Congestion on WIS 65 will be noticeably less following construction of the Roberts Bypass and reconstruction of WIS 65 between Roberts and New Richmond. Delay and indirection of traffic flow can be expected during construction. However, the long-term benefits of the proposed project will far outweigh these temporary delays. Reconstructing the facility will provide a safer, more efficient roadway for those using it, thus promoting the general economics of the surrounding areas. See the General Economics Factor Sheet.
B. Community and Residential	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seven residences would be relocated by the preferred alternatives. Each resident and property owner would be eligible for relocation assistance according to the Federal Uniform Relocation Act of 1972. WIS 65 traffic, as well USH 12 traffic from the west will not travel through the Traffic volumes through the Village of Roberts will decrease substantially, allowing improved connection between the north and south portions of the village. See the Community and Residential Factor Sheet.
C. Economic Development and Business	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No businesses will be relocated as a direct result of the project. Access to businesses may change, as will the exposure of businesses along the existing WIS 65 in Roberts. Construction of the Roberts Bypass will help define an area south of Roberts where commercial development is planned.
D. Agriculture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seven farm buildings from one farm will be relocated due to the preferred alternative. Each property owner would be eligible for relocation assistance according to the Federal Uniform Relocation Act of 1972. Approximately 146 acres of farmland would be converted to highway right-of-way and existing farms would be severed. Much of the farmland that will be converted to highway right-of-way or otherwise lost due to the project has been slated for future development, as indicated in the <i>Village of Roberts – Town of Warren Comprehensive Plan</i> (2002). An Agricultural Impact Statement (AIS) has not been prepared in conjunction with this Environmental Assessment because this assessment is conducted to map and

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS	EFFECTS				COMMENTS
	Adverse	Benefit	None	Not Applicable	
					preserve the WIS 65 corridor. Due to the expected population growth and development in the project area, it is likely that existing farmland will not be farmland when the project is constructed. An AIS will be completed as construction plans are set and land use in the corridor is identifiable. See the Agriculture Factor Sheet.
E. Environmental Justice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The public involvement process has been, and will continue to be, inclusive of all residents and population groups in the study area and will not exclude any person because of income, race, religion, color, national origin, sex, age or handicap. The public has been, and will continue to be, adequately informed of the public informational meetings through newspaper advertisements and through a mailing to all known adjacent property owners. The public informational meetings have been, and will continue to be, held at a handicapped accessible location. See the Environmental Justice Factor Sheet.
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS					
F. Wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project corridor affects existing wetlands with impacts resulting from filling, storm water runoff, and water level changes from ditching and draining. The preferred alternative would disturb approximately 0.5 acres of wetland; the wetland loss would be mitigated. Although the effect of wetland loss could be adverse, the wetland quality of the mitigation site will be of higher quality than that of the wetlands within the project corridor. See the Wetland Factor Sheet.
G. Streams and Floodplains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The preferred alternative crosses an unnamed, seasonal tributary of the Kinnickinnic River; Tenmile Creek, and two unnamed tributaries of Tenmile Creek and the floodplains associated with these water bodies. Tenmile Creek, a tributary to the Willow River, is classified as class II trout water. Increased runoff from the reconstructed roadway could impair the water quality; however, storm water best management practices will be implemented. See the Streams and Floodplains Factor Sheet.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS	EFFECTS				COMMENTS
	Adverse	Benefit	None	Not Applicable	
H. Lakes or Other Open Water	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No open water bodies will be directly affected (filling, bridging, etc.) by the preferred WIS 65 alternative. Additional erosion and storm water runoff caused by an increase in impermeable surface could affect the water quality of Twin Lakes as well as approximately 5 unnamed ponds. Storm water management best practices will be implemented.
I. Upland Habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The preferred WIS 65 alternative would convert approximately five acres of upland habitat to highway right-of-way. The lands are scattered throughout the project corridor and are characterized by areas that were not identified as agricultural plots or residential yards. The lands categorized as upland are occupied by undeveloped open lands, pine lots or mesic lots. See the Upland Habitat Factor Sheet.
J. Erosion Control	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Road construction could potentially affect erosion control, but best management practices will be implemented according to all governing ordinances and policies for construction and long-term management. See the Erosion Control Factor Sheet.
K. Storm Water Management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Road construction could potentially affect erosion control, but best management practices will be implemented according to all governing ordinances and policies for construction and long-term management. See the Erosion Control Factor Sheet.
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT FACTORS					
L. Air Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This project is exempt from permit requirements under Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter NR 411. No substantial impacts to air quality are expected. See the Air Quality Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet.
M. Construction Stage Sound Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	To reduce the potential impact of construction noise, the special provisions for this project will require that motorized equipment shall be operated in compliance with all applicable local, state and federal laws and regulations relating to noise levels permissible within and adjacent to the project construction site. At a minimum, the special

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS	EFFECTS				COMMENTS
	Adverse	Benefit	None	Not Applicable	
					provisions will require that motorized construction equipment shall not be operated between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. without the prior written approval of the project engineer. All motorized construction equipment will be required to have mufflers constructed in accordance with the equipment manufacturer's specifications or a system of equivalent noise reducing capacity. It will also be required that mufflers and exhaust systems be maintained in good operating condition, free from leaks and holes. See the Construction Stage Sound Quality Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet.
N. Traffic Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		To provide the reader with an idea of noise levels after construction of the proposed roadway compared to current conditions, a theoretical model was produced. See the Traffic Noise Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet.
CULTURAL ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS					
O. Section, 4(f) and 6(f)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable
P. Historic Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable. An historical reconnaissance and evaluation study of the area of potential effect did not produce any properties or structures potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. A summary of the study's findings is presented in Appendix B; a complete report documenting the study is available upon request.
Q. Archaeological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable. A Phase 1 archaeological investigation has been completed. No sites were found to be eligible for the National Register. A summary of the study's findings is presented in Appendix B; a complete report documenting the study is available upon request.
R. Hazardous Substances or UST's	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Two sites of potential environmental concern were identified near the proposed alignment. Neither of these sites are located within the projected project right-of-way. Further investigation of these sites will occur just prior to construction of the roadway. Initially, the existence of hazardous substances or USTs in the project corridor would be an adverse effect because of additional costs required for corrective action. However, the improved environmental conditions resulting from corrective

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS	EFFECTS				COMMENTS
	Adverse	Benefit	None	Not Applicable	
					action would be an overall benefit. See the Hazardous Substances or USTs Factor Sheet.
S. Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		North of Roberts, impacts on the rural character of the land adjacent to WIS 65 are minimized by the proposed action remaining on-alignment as much as possible. See the Aesthetics Factor Sheet for more information on this topic.
T. Coastal Zone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable
U. Other – Indirect Effects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Increased capacity and the resulting increased accessibility could enable some dispersion of residential in the area of the WIS 65 corridor. Increase accessibility from the corridor to I-94 and vice versa may result in an increase of commercial business along the corridor. Relocating WIS 65 around Roberts may cause commercial businesses to relocate from the existing WIS 65 corridor to interchange or intersection access points along the new corridor.
U. Other – Cumulative Effects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The cumulative effects of the preferred alternative include the direct effects of its construction and the secondary effects spurred by the roadway improvements. The cumulative effects will impact farmland, wetland, and stormwater runoff within and adjacent to the WIS 65 corridor. The extent of the cumulative effects to farmland is anticipated to be moderate with the majority of the cumulative effects resulting from the residential and commercial development around Roberts. The WIS 65 project and other projects in the area will make the corridor more accessible and may cause and increase in residential development. Much of this development is likely to occur even without the construction of the preferred alternative because of the rapid growth in St. Croix County. The extent of the cumulative effects on the wetlands and stormwater is anticipated to be moderate. See the cumulative effects discussion on the Environmental Issues Basic Sheet for additional information on this topic.

ENVIRONMENTAL COST MATRIX
Transportation Improvements

Environmental Issue	Unit Measure			
		No Build	Section 1: Interstate 94 to 110 th Avenue	Section 2: 110 th Avenue to Paperjack Street
Project Length	Mi (Km)		5.0	5.5
Cost \$				
Construction	Million \$		17.7	13.5
Real Estate	Million \$			
Total	Million \$			
Land Conversions				
Total Area Converted to R/W	Acres		215.9	93.5
Wetland Area Converted to R/W	Acres		0.5	0
Upland Area Converted to R/W	Acres		5.8	4
Other Area Converted to R/W	Acres		210.1	89.5
Real Estate				
Number of Farms Affected	Number		11 (8 included in community's plan for development)	6
Total Area From Farm Operations Required	Acres		198	59
AIS Required?	Yes/No		[1]	[1]
Farmland Rating	Score		NA	
Total Buildings Required	Number		8	6
Housing Units Required	Number		1	6
Commercial Units Required	Number		0	0
Other Buildings or Structures Required	Number (Type)		7 farm buildings	0
Environmental Issues				
Flood Plain	Yes/No		No	No
Stream Crossings	Number		0	3

Environmental Issue	Unit Measure			
		No Build	Section 1: Interstate 94 to 110 th Avenue	Section 2: 110 th Avenue to Paperjack Street
Endangered Species	Yes/No		No	No
Historic Properties	Number		No	No
Archeological Sites	Number		No	No
106 MOA Required?	Yes/No		No	No
4(f) Evaluation Required?	Yes/No		No	No
Environ Justice At Issue?	Yes/No		No ^[2]	No ^[2]
Air Quality Permit?	Yes/No		No	No
Design Year Noise Sensitive Receptors			Theoretical receptor analysis	Theoretical receptor analysis
No Impact	Number			
Impacted	Number			
Exceed dBA Levels	Number			
Contaminated Sites	Number		1	1

^[1] Corridor characteristics are anticipated to change dramatically before construction. If needed, an AIS shall be done closer to the start of construction.

^[2] According to 2000 US Census population statistics for the block level.